

Appl. No. 10/660,241
Reply dated November 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated May 13, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. New claims 18-20 are added by this Amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Claims:

Claims 1-3 and 17 stand rejected on the following grounds:

- Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,589,069 to Liao.
- Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US Pat. No. 5,982,138 to Kreiger.
- Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Liao '069.

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102(b)

Claim 1 of the subject application is the only independent claim. Claim 1 requires:

- a. An electrical extension lead, comprising an electrical cable having a first end and a second end,
- b. having the first end connected to a plug socket arrangement for supplying electricity to electrical devices,
- c. and with the second end connected to an electrical plug for connection to electrical supply sources,
- d. characterized in that a battery pack charging assembly is also connected to the first end of the cable, which charging assembly is suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices.

US Pat. No. 6,589,069 to Liao:

The Examiner states that Liao '069 discloses "an electrical extension lead, comprising an electrical cable 14 having a first end (not marked) and a second end (not marked),

Appl. No. 10/660,241
Reply dated November 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated May 13, 2004

having the first end connected to plug socket arrangement 13 for supplying electricity to electrical devices 50, and with the second end connected to an electrical plug 22 for connection to electrical supply sources (see Col. 3, lines 10-13), characterized in that a battery pack charging assembly 70 is also connected (electrically) to the first end of the cable, which battery pack charging assembly 70 is suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices.” The Applicant respectfully submits that this description of Liao ‘069 is incorrect.

Firstly, the “plug socket arrangement” (connector) 13 does not supply electricity to electrical device 50. Actually, connector 13 is used to draw power from portable device 50 (in Fig. 5 a laptop computer) for the purpose of charging another portable device 60 (in Fig. 5 a cell phone). Col. 3 lines 7-17.

Secondly, the component that the Examiner describes as “battery pack charging assembly 70 . . . which battery pack charging assembly 70 is suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices” is not “a battery pack charging assembly . . . suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices,” as required by Claim 1. Rather, it is “a commercially available dry battery 70.” Col. 3 lines 20-21. Furthermore, battery 70 is not located in battery connecting base 15 for the purpose of being charged itself. Instead, battery 70 is an alternative power source to the wire reel 10 for the purpose of charging portable device 80 (or 60). Col. 3 lines 18-27.

Thus, Liao ‘069 discloses an emergency charging device that has two alternative sources of power (either USB connector 13 or battery connecting base 15). Col. 3 lines 31-33. But, Liao ‘069 discloses only a single output (line 14 with plug 22) for supplying/charging a portable electrical device 60/80. Col 2 lines 56-58.

In contrast, Claim 1 requires only a single power source, “an electrical extension lead . . . with the second end connected to an electrical plug for connection to electrical supply sources” (see claim element c. above), but it also requires two outputs, “an electrical extension lead . . . the first end connected to a plug socket arrangement for

Appl. No. 10/660,241
Reply dated November 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated May 13, 2004

supplying electricity to electrical devices" (see claim element b. above) and "a battery pack charging assembly . . . which charging assembly is suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices" (see claim element d. above). Although the Liao '069 output of line 14 with plug 22 may satisfy one of the two output limitations of Claim 1, it does not satisfy both.

Moreover, it would not be proper to read both of the output limitations (b. and d. above) from Claim 1 onto the single output structure of Liao '069. Claim 1 clearly requires separate outputs to satisfy the intended purpose of simultaneously providing both direct power to one load and battery charging capability of another load from substantially the same end of a single extension lead. See Application paragraph 0006 ["While a mains powered device, for example a power tool, being powered via the electrical extension lead is being used, a battery pack can be charged"].

Therefore, Claim 1 does not read on and is not anticipated by Liao '069.

Regarding Claim 2, the Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 2 is dependent from Claim 1. Since it is demonstrated above that Liao '069 does not anticipate independent Claim 1, it cannot anticipate dependent Claim 2.

US Pat. No. 5,982,138 to Krieger:

The Examiner states that Krieger '138 discloses "an electrical extension lead, comprising an electrical cable 36, 34 having a first end (not marked, area 34) and a second end (nor marked, area 36), having the first end connected to a plug socket arrangement 56 for supplying electricity to electrical devices kk, and the second end connected to an electrical plug 36 for connecting to electrical supply sources (see Col. 4, lines 56-59), characterized in that a battery pack charging assembly (not shown, see Col. 3, lines 34-36) is also connected (electrically) to the first end of the cable, which charging assembly bb is suitable for charging battery packs for powering electrical devices." The Applicant respectfully submits that this description of Liao '069 is incorrect.

Appl. No. 10/660,241
Reply dated November 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated May 13, 2004

For example, and even assuming for sake of argument that the jump start system 10 may be characterized as a battery pack charging assembly, the jump start system 10 is not connected to the first end of the cable 38, which first end was previously defined as the end where the alleged plug socket arrangement 56 is located. Rather the jump start system 10 is located at the second end (area 36) of the cable, where the cable 38 takes power from the battery within the case 12. See Col 3. lines 33-35 and Figs. 3 and 4. Thus, the Kreiger device discloses a cord/lead 38 having a plug socket arrangement 56 at one end and (assumed) a battery charging system 10 at the other end (which other end is also the power supply end).

Claim 1, however, requires that the plug socket arrangement for supplying electricity to electrical devices (element b. above) and a battery pack charging assembly (element d. above) are both connected to the same first end of the cable. Claim 1 also requires that the second end of the cable is connected to an electrical plug for connection to electrical supply sources. Thus and in contrast to the Krieger device, Claim 1 requires that both the plug socket arrangement and battery pack charging assembly be located at one end of a cable (the load end) remote from the other end (the supply end).

Nor, as the Examiner may be suggesting in her remarks, should the claim limitation be read to cover a structure (such as Kreiger) wherein a battery pack charging assembly is merely electrically connected to the first end of the cable, albeit at a distance and via the cord itself. Such a reading would render the limitations to the first and second ends of the cable superfluous, as electrically speaking all the components physically connected to the cable are electrically connected to both ends (indeed all points along) the cable. Furthermore, when read in light of the Specification, it is clear that the limitations to specific ends of the cable intend a physical connection at or substantially at those ends, in order to serve the objects of the invention. See Paragraph [0006].

Therefore, Krieger '138 does not anticipate Claim 1 of the subject application.

Appl. No. 10/660,241
Reply dated November 12, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated May 13, 2004

Regarding Claims 2 and 3, the Applicant respectfully notes that Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from Claim 1. Since it is demonstrated above that Krieger '138 does not anticipate independent Claim 1, it cannot anticipate dependent Claims 2 and 3.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Regarding the rejection of Claim 17 as unpatentable over Liao '069, the Applicant respectfully notes that Claim 17 is dependent from Claim 1. Since it is demonstrated above that Liao '069 does not anticipate independent Claim 1, then Claim 17 is also patentable over Liao '069 and the question of whether the Claim 17 limitations alone differentiate from the prior art is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the Action the Examiner has indicated that claims 4-6 and 7-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. He believes, however, that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 are traversed for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, for the present he respectfully declines to amend the claims as suggested.

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the consideration shown to the Application, and believes that the arguments herein appropriately answer and traverse the rejections raised. The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted



Michael P. Leary
Registration No. 41,144
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 12, 2004

Michael Leary - TW199
The Black & Decker Corporation
701 East Joppa Road
Towson, Maryland 21286
Telephone: (410) 716-2773